b) REMARKS

The claims under examination are 1-10, with claims 11-13 having been withdrawn as non-elected. Should the instant examined claims be allowed, it is requested that claims 11-13 be rejoined under M.P.E.P. §821.04. If so, Applicant requests an opportunity to amend the claims 11-13 to be coextensive with the allowed claims. If rejoinder is not permitted, the Examiner is authorized to cancel claims 11-13.

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Shiratori '825. Claims 2-10 were rejected as obvious over Shiratori. The Examiner argues that Shiratori discloses in columns 8-10, a process for depositing a magnetic layer onto a substrate and irradiating the magnetic layer with a laser beam while applying a magnetic field and annealing the magnetic layer between information tracks. The grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Prior to addressing the grounds of rejection, Applicant wishes to briefly review certain key features and advantages of the present claimed invention. The present invention includes a method of making a domain wall displacement-type magneto-optical recording medium by depositing a magnetic layer on a substrate and irradiating the magnetic layer with a converged light beam while applying a magnetic field and annealing the magnetic layer between information tracks.

The Examiner's attention is directed to instant Comparative Example 3 on pages 20-22 of the specification. In Comparative Example 3, an annealing magnetic field was not applied at the time of forming the anneal track on the magneto-optical disc. As illustrated in Table 1, the results show that annealing without the magnetic field provides

poor results with regard to pulse jitter. Accordingly, the present claimed invention provides enhanced Duty difference and Jitter value of a reproduction signal.

The portions of Shiratori disclosing an annealing treatment of a magnetic layer between information tracks during production can be found, inter alia, in column 11, lines 55-61 and column 14, lines 62-67. These portions merely provide that a high power laser beam is projected onto the guide groove portions to anneal the entire magnetic layer at the guide groove portions. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion as to carrying out such an annealing treatment when applying a magnetic field.

The Examiner has argued that in columns 8-10 a process is disclosed for depositing a magnetic layer onto a substrate, irradiating the magnetic layer with a laser beam, while applying a magnetic field and annealing the magnetic layer between information tracks. However, the disclosure at columns 8-10 relied upon by the Examiner, does not deal with producing a magneto-optical medium. Instead, the disclosure merely teaches how to record or reproduce information present in the magneto-optical recording medium. The Examiner's attention is directed to column 8, lines 12-15; column 9, lines 29-31 and column 10, lines 1 and 2. In each portion, it is clearly cited that the recording or reproducing characteristics were measured by the method described.

Accordingly, Shiratori cannot anticipate the present claimed invention, since it fails to teach annealing the magnetic layer while applying a magnetic field during the process for making the magneto-optical recording medium.

Further, Shiratori does not render obvious the present claimed invention, since it is subject to the same defects as shown in instant Comparative Example 3.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims are allowable and that the case should be passed to issue.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 24947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 380220v1